

1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20281

This is a landmark bill. It is satisfying to know that after we have struggled for years to have the Senate pass a sound piece of legislation, some accomplishment, at long last, has been attained.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Oregon. As a comparatively new Senator, I have received particular delight, because in the previous Congress, although we were successful in having a bill reported from committee, we were unsuccessful in having it passed by either body. I know how long the Senator from Oregon and other Senators have worked for this measure. I am grateful for their success.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his courtesy in yielding and for his generous remarks.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

#### TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1136) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to pay fair value for improvements located on the railroad right-of-way owned by bona fide lessees or permittees.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4844) relating to the release of liability under bonds filed under section 44(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to certain installment obligations transmitted at death.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5739) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct certain inequities with respect to the taxation of life insurance companies.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10467) to continue for a temporary period certain existing rules relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill

(H.R. 12196) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries, to adjust pay alignment, and for other purposes.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 4. An act to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes;

S. 3049. An act to extend and amend relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes;

H.R. 439. An act to provide for the establishment of the John Muir National Historic Site in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H.R. 931. An act to provide for the establishment of the Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historic Site, and the Johnstown Flood National Memorial in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1794. An act to authorize payment for certain interests in lands within the Allegheny Indian Reservation in New York, required by the United States for the Allegheny River (Kinzua Dam) project, to provide for the relocation, rehabilitation, social and economic development of the members of the Seneca Nation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3545. An act to amend section 131 of title 13, United States Code, so as to provide for taking of the economic censuses 1 year earlier starting in 1968;

H.R. 4364. An act to provide for the free entry of certain articles imported for the use of certain universities;

H.R. 5837. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain Indian lands on the Yakima Indian Reservation, and for other purposes," approved July 28, 1955;

H.R. 6910. An act to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8960. An act to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, in order to promote the development of coal on the public domain, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9178. An act to amend section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10178. An act to authorize the Smithsonian Institution to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity; and

H.R. 11846. An act to amend the act of August 19, 1958, to permit purchase of processed food grain products in addition to purchase of flour and cornmeal and donating the same for certain domestic and foreign purposes.

#### APPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair (for the President pro tempore) announces the appointment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] as a member of the delegation on the part of the Senate to the Interparliamentary Union Conference at Copenhagen, beginning August 22, vice the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHEL], resigned.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that he had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

On August 20, 1964:

S. 284. An act for the relief of Ethel R. Loop, the widow of Carl R. Loop;

S. 1006. An act to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes;

S. 2288. An act for the relief of John J. Feeney;

S. 2944. An act for the relief of the Greater Community Hospital Foundation, Inc.; and

S. 3075. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

On August 21, 1964:

S. 26. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie project, Utah, and for other purposes;

S. 793. An act to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific flyway in the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, Upper Klamath, and Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California and to aid in the administration of the Klamath reclamation project;

S. 1007. An act to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes;

S. 1169. An act to authorize a per capita distribution of \$350 from funds arising from judgments in favor of any of the Federated Tribes of the Colville Reservation; and

S. 2961. An act to provide for the disposition of the judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe of the Tongue River Indian Reservation, Mont.

#### AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not know how I could pay greater respect to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for the brilliant, cogent, unanswerably logical speech that he has made against the Dirksen amendment and the Tuck bill than to make a very few remarks of my own supplementing two speeches that I have already made on this subject matter.

I say to my friend from Illinois that I have never felt better in all my 20 years in the Senate. I have recently had a health report that announces that I am in a No. 1 condition. It would be interesting to see if cloture can be applied to those of us who seek to prevent the passage of an obviously, patently, clearly unconstitutional act. I want the Senator to know that, if he will not take offense, I know him so well, I want him to know that I have waited for some 20 years in the Senate to get liberal Senators to openly, confessedly filibuster with me.

This is the first time that I have had Senators tell me that they were going beyond the point of a prolonged debate.

It is important when we get to the point of seeking to protect the American people from the attempt to put a yoke

around them of unconstitutionality and deny to them a precious right that the Supreme Court has handed down in the case of Baker against Carr, that we should filibuster until the country can speak. If there had not been Senators such as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] or the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] and the others who have participated in the debate in the past 10 days or so, to the end that the leadership of this body has laid aside from time to time the Dirksen amendment and taken up other business of the Senate, we would already have passed in this body the Dirksen amendment which, as I said the other day, is patently unconstitutional. And we would have undercut and undermined the judicial processes of this Government. And we would have aided and abetted one of the most malicious, subversive trends in this country. It is a trend that is sweeping the Nation now—the trend that seeks to build up a disrespect for the U.S. Supreme Court.

I would have the American people remember that all their constitutional rights, and the preservation of all their constitutional rights hinges upon the protection of the inherent constitutional power that the U.S. Supreme Court decreed in the 1803 decision of Marbury against Madison. I am willing to stand in the Senate and protest the Dirksen amendment for as many hours as it may take, until finally the American people will come to their senses and make perfectly clear to their Senators from the 50 States of this Republic their obligation to see to it that the Dirksen amendment is not passed.

I disassociate myself from the comments that were made on the floor of the Senate, not only today, but in the past days, that all that is sought is to get the time for the legislatures to act.

The rotten borough legislatures of the country want the defendant to pass judgment upon his own guilt and impose his own sentence, which would be, of course, a rotten acquittal.

Mr. President, I have abiding faith in the judgment of the American people, once they get the facts. But there has been so much confusion in regard to this matter because of the platitudinous propaganda that has been fed to the American people by so much of the press, although at long last we are getting some editors—not enough, but we are getting some editors—to start analyzing the constitutional dangers of the Dirksen amendment.

As the Senator from Illinois said in his closing remarks, I believe it is good that we will have a recess or adjournment, for 10 days. I believe it is good that the American people will have a few days in which it may be possible, if the information can be presented to them, to reflect upon the arguments that have been made in the past 10 days or 2 weeks against the Dirksen amendment. Because of the recess for 10 days, this is the last opportunity I shall have, until the Senate reconvenes, to make a few brief remarks in opposition to the Dirksen amendment.

So that no one will be taken by surprise, I have already notified the leadership. I have cooperated again, as I have for years here in the Senate, in withholding my speeches until the end of the day on the subject matters that do not involve the particular pending business of the day.

I have three topics that I shall discuss tonight briefly.

I shall discuss briefly my opposition to the Dirksen amendment. I shall call the attention of the Senate and the country to our involvement, to our discredit, in the Turkish atrocities against Cyprus. I shall once again speak out in opposition to, and criticism of, the making of war by the United States in southeast Asia.

#### REAPPORTIONMENT—THE DIRKSEN AMENDMENT

Adjournment of Congress has been held up by a last-minute effort to change the jurisdiction and authority of the Federal courts to prevent them from enforcing reapportionment orders upon State legislatures.

It reveals a rather interesting fact of our political life. The Federal courts have upheld constitutional rights relating to race, and relating to unpopular and radical ideas in decisions that have caused great public controversy and outcry. But the only time Congress moved to curb the courts was when they enforced the constitutional right to equal representation in the State legislature. Obviously, this group of decisions, starting with Baker against Carr in 1962, touched the heart of political machinery at the State and local levels that has survived decades of population shifts. So the Congress responded to the alarms from State politicians whose jobs were in jeopardy, although it did not respond to alarms over other decisions that had far greater impact upon the average citizen.

That is what the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] got through pointing out a few moments ago. Politicians at the State and the local level, who hold their offices under a rotten borough system in the United States, see that time has caught up with them and that at long last the Supreme Court has caught up with them. They are putting on a terrific political power drive to prevent reapportionment on the basis of the sound, democratic principle that one person should have one vote.

His vote should be weighted as one vote and not weighted as four, five, or six votes, which is exactly the case in those areas in which the city dweller is allowed much less weight as far as his voting influences are concerned than the rural dweller.

Every Senator has a right and a duty to speak on this subject. But I am pleased to say, with State pride boasting, that no one has a greater right to speak on it than the Senators from Oregon, for Oregon has, for the time at least, solved the problem. Oregon is the purest democratic State in the Nation. Oregon has a popular government to a degree that no other State of the 50 States has. Oregon has direct control of the politicians by the people. Oregon has operated for years under the famous Oregon system of initiative, referendum, and recall. Oregon has no strings attached to

its popular government, for the legislature cannot control in any way the exercise of the Oregon initiative and referendum. The Oregon people, by the exercise of popular government, have placed themselves at all times above the politicians and in control of the politicians, and have the authority to take away from the politicians unsound action taken by them in the legislature. The people of Oregon, by the initiative process, have reapportioned in accordance with population. The people of my State, to a degree that no other State has reached, have made perfectly clear that one vote in Oregon shall have the weight of but one vote. They have also rejected a proposal that the State constitution be changed to permit the "rotten" borough system to gain a foothold.

That is what this issue is about. At long last, will we support the decision of the Supreme Court on constitutional grounds or will the Congress of the United States be a party to weakening the prestige for and the respect of the American people in the Supreme Court?

I should like to say to the American people from my desk in the Senate tonight: "If you permit yourselves to be victimized by this propaganda, you will deserve exactly what you get."

Mr. President, I should like to say to the people in the rural areas of America: "You have as much of a precious right at stake in seeing to it that the decisions of the Supreme Court are upheld by the defeat of this vicious proposed legislation that seeks to undercut the judicial authority of the Supreme Court as any citizen voting in any metropolitan area of the Nation."

If the time ever comes when we cease to have a government based on three coordinate and coequal branches of government, but in contrast thereto have a government in which either the executive or the legislature becomes supreme, it will only be a question of time before the American people will cease to be the masters of their Government. That means that the liberty and the freedom of the individual will soon degenerate and wither away.

So I plead once again tonight for the American people to settle this question. I say to the American people that if we let this question come to a vote in the Senate now, the Dirksen amendment will be adopted.

We have no intention of preventing a vote from ever occurring. But as I have been heard to say many times in my 20 years in this body, sometimes it is necessary to stand against the tide. Sometimes it is necessary to stand against the overwhelming majority until the people have an opportunity to speak. Frequently, when that happens, the overwhelming majority withers away, and what was a majority changes into a minority, and what was a minority changes into a majority.

For 13 days and 6 nights in 1954 we filibustered the Eisenhower giveaway of the taxpayers' rights and interests in the atomic energy program. We added to it one amendment after another to protect the public interest, not one of which

1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20283

would have been adopted had we yielded to the steamroller in 1954.

Mr. President, we let the issue come to a vote after the people had been heard from. It was very interesting to hear the conversations of Senators who early in the debate were very critical of us, but who ended up voting with us.

I shall tell the Senate why they voted with us. They heard from the people.

Had we not consumed that time, the people would never have had an opportunity to be heard from. My faith is such—perhaps I should say my hope is such—that Members of the Senate will hear from the people in the next 10 days, for I am satisfied that, abstract as this problem is, technical as this problem is, if we can get the salient facts of this problem across to the American people, they will make clear to their representatives in Congress their opposition to this giveaway. This giveaway is worth much more to them than the \$14 billion of the Eisenhower giveaway program in the atomic energy bill of 1954. A dollar value cannot be put on this giveaway, for it concerns precious constitutional rights, and they are priceless. Yet the House of Representatives has passed a bill to forbid all Federal courts from hearing reapportionment cases.

I want the Americans voters to have a little time to reflect upon what their elected Representatives have done in the House of Representatives. Then I want them to remember that an election is to be held in November. There is only one place to teach politicians the truth about the desires of the voters, and that is at the ballot box. There are many politicians in both Houses of Congress who ought to take a shellacking and a whipping and a retirement in November.

Mr. President, I say to the American people: "Please bear in mind that the reapportionment cases, like the civil rights cases, have arisen from that portion of the 14th amendment to the Constitution which requires that each State must give its citizens equal protection of the law."

In article VI of the Constitution, the so-called Federal supremacy clause states:

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States, which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

Every American citizen recognizes that that is one of the great blessings of constitutionalism, from which flow the constitutional rights of the American people. It is difficult for them to understand fully why we who protest the Tuck bill and the Dirksen amendment feel as strongly about them as we do.

Thus it was that the Federal courts found that equal protection of the law is denied to people when their State legislature is apportioned by area rather than by population. That is exactly what is sought to be perpetuated in the Tuck bill and the Dirksen amendment. Now it is proposed to forbid the courts to hear

those cases and to apply the ban retroactively to cases already decided, but where reapportionment has not actually been carried out.

That such a law is beyond the power of Congress to enact is made evident again by the Constitution itself. The Constitution states that "the judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution." It does not say "some"; it does not say "the cases that Congress shall select"; it says—and I repeat it, for this is a key provision of the Constitution that is controlling in the jurisdictional issue.

(At this point, Mr. SALINGER took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MORSE. That "the judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution." The Congress has certain authority to determine when an appeal can be taken, but it has no authority whatsoever to prevent all Federal courts from hearing cases arising out of an alleged denial of a constitutional right, as the Tuck bill provides.

On the contrary, Mr. President, Chief Justice Marshall in 1803, in *Marberry* against Madison, settled for all time under our Constitution that the power to decree constitutional rights vests in the court and nowhere else. The Constitution vests no power in the Congress or in the executive branch of the Government to construe constitutional rights. That power resides in the U.S. Supreme Court. Does that mean an unchecked power? Of course not. For all these powers of the Federal Government are ultimately vested in the people.

So, the Constitution provides for a constitutional amendment process but that is the only process. That is the only procedure. That is the only check. That is the only check that can reverse the Supreme Court.

Unfortunately, this whole proposal was passed by the House of Representatives. The Senate has a different version, the Dirksen amendment. It acts to direct the Federal court so that execution of reapportionment orders will take at least 2 years. The purpose of the delay is to give the States time to adopt a constitutional amendment preserving their malapportionment. In my opinion, this, too, is unconstitutional. The Congress has no power to direct the courts on how to exercise the judicial power any more than it can take away that judicial power.

I have made the argument that the Congress has no authority to take away judicial power. It has no authority to direct the Supreme Court as to how it shall exercise that judicial power. The particular proposal known as the Dirksen amendment has been offered as an amendment to the foreign aid bill. I shall continue to oppose it as an illegal interference with the judicial department of our Government, and an unwise attempt to perpetuate malapportionment within the States.

It has been suggested to me that I should remain silent on this matter because I am against foreign aid. I am against foreign aid in the form of the present bill, but I am not against for-

eign aid, as I have said many times. I would vote more money for foreign aid than any administration in recent years has proposed, but I will not vote any money for foreign aid on the basis of the programs of foreign aid that the administrations in recent years have proposed. That is the difference. But because I am against foreign aid, I am not going to be a party to legislating by rider or using the legislative rider to accomplish an end that I should like to see accomplished because I object to the means.

That is why some problems have not been solved at the State level—urban renewal, sewage problems, pollution of streams, juvenile delinquency problems, crime problems, we can go on down the long list of needed social welfare legislation and find that the States have not made themselves instrumentalities for the solution of those problems at the State level. Thus, we have seen the mayors of our large cities, and the Governors of our States, come to the Federal Government pleading with the Federal Government to exercise Federal jurisdiction. The Federal Government has had to do it if it is going to protect the general welfare of the American people.

I do not believe in the dangerous fallacy that the end justifies the means. I believe that it is a mistake to legislate by legislative rider. This particular legislative rider is so inherently bad that I could not possibly remain silent while it is offered to a bill that I should like to see defeated; namely, the present foreign aid bill. The foreign aid bill should be beaten on the basis of its demerits—and it is honeycombed with demerits.

After all, States have declined as an instrument of government because of their failure to reapportion their legislatures according to the population. As the Senator from Illinois pointed out this evening, because of the rotten-borough system which exists in many of our States, where the rural areas dominate the State legislatures, where one vote in the rural area has more weight than a vote in the city, the States have been unable, through their State legislatures, to adopt needed progressive legislation essential to protecting and developing the general welfare of the people of the State.

Let me say to the so-called States' righters that the reason the Federal Government has had to exercise more and more authority within its constitutional prerogatives is that the States have failed to furnish needed services. And they have to furnish them because they have perpetuated the rotten-borough system. They have not reapportioned their legislatures so that one vote throughout a State means one vote, and undue weight is not given to a vote from a rural area.

Thus, I repeat, the cities have been unable to have their problems considered at the State level through legislations, so they have come to Washington for programs.

Reapportionment as required by the Federal courts will revive and reinvigorate the States. Those who wish the States restored to active participation in the Federal system should join in wel-

coming action of the courts, and join in opposing these measures pending in the Congress.

It is my plea and my fervent hope that the American people, in the 10-day recess that will now take place before we reconvene following the Atlantic City convention, will make clear to its representatives in the Congress that they wish both the Tuck bill and the Dirksen amendment defeated.

#### THE CYPRUS ISSUE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now turn to the second of the three topics that I announced at the beginning I would discuss tonight.

I read a telegram that I have received from Dr. William Angelos, president of the Order of Ahepa, a Greek organization, Mount Hood Chapter, Portland, Oreg.

I read the telegram, really, as a prayer, to which I most appropriately will say at the end, "Amen."

The telegram reads:

The unprovoked attack by the Turks upon the Cyprus people constitutes a violation of sovereignty of the Cyprus Republic. We urge the U.S. Government to permit the United Nations to settle this controversy around the conference table where justice will prevail and war be averted.

To which I say: "Amen."

Amen. That ought to be the prayer of every lover of peace. Mr. President, unless the acts of aggression against Cyprus and the internal strife of Greek Cypriot against Turkish Cypriot come to an end, there is serious danger that the conflict over Cyprus will lead to a Mediterranean war. And history shows that when war breaks out in that part of the world, it has a tendency to extend far beyond that part of the world. Even the assassination of an archduke can lead to a world war.

One cannot view what is going on in the Cyprus area, by way of violation of international law without being as concerned as I am about the danger of the Cyprus issue spreading into a broadened international conflagration.

We had better take a look at our new policies. For it is the United States of America, our own country, that has supplied the planes; that has supplied the napalm bombs, the atrocious, inhumane fire bomb; that has supplied all of the military equipment used by the dictatorship government of Turkey to violate one international convention after another in its atrocious attack upon Cyprus.

Interestingly enough, we have supplied all of the military equipment to Greece, under our notorious military aid program, that now puts Greece and Turkey in a position where they are a threat to the peace of the world. They are now rattling American military aid as a threat to the peace of the world. And Turkey is using NATO equipment to carry on its devastating, inhumane, atrocious attack against Cyprus.

Why, I would not be a bit surprised if some Senator in a speech might refer to those as rash words. They are conservative words, Mr. President.

The radicals, people who are resorting to rashness, are the people in this body who are trying to defend this Government's policies in the field of foreign policies where those policies are resulting in aggressive courses of action. They are the radicals, Mr. President. Those of us who dare to stand up in this body and criticize our Government for supporting aggression around the world, and for being instrumental in making it possible for aggression to be carried on around the world are the conservatives. Those of us who are pleading for peace are not radicals. And those of us who are pleading for peace are not rash. But those who are supporting this administration's policy in the field of foreign policy in respect to military aid being supplied to Greece and Turkey—when we know right along the great danger was that Greece and Turkey would go to war against each other, and when we knew right along that that military aid might be used for an attack on Cyprus—are the ones who are engaging in rash conduct. And their words in defense of that policy are words of rashness. Those of us who are pleading for peace, those of us who are pleading for a stopping of the killing, those of us who are pleading for the conference table, and those of us who are asking for political and diplomatic settlement of these disputes—we are the conservatives. We are the ones who are making pleas for moderation, not rashness.

This is a horrible thing that has occurred on Cyprus. This is a course of conduct by Turkey that will go down in the annals of history as another example of inhumanity to man, for this is a repetition of the atrocities of Hitler. There have been atrocities, too, against the Turkish Cypriots.

But this is a case of the Turks using some of the most modern planes that the United States produces, delivered to Turkey in just the last few weeks, to bomb innocent civilians, a hospital, and two ambulances—located miles away from any base of military action.

I regret that the protests of the American Government have not been much stronger—and to the United Nations—over this inhumanity of this Turkish dictatorship.

That is why some days ago I urged in the debate on the foreign aid bill, before it was laid aside, that military aid to Turkey and Greece be brought to an end.

Mr. President, Congress cannot justify granting one further dollar to either Turkey or Greece for military aid. It is American military aid to Turkey and Greece that is endangering the peace of the world. It is not worth anything to us as far as any defense against Russia is concerned.

I repeat, as I have said before, does anyone think that if we got into a war with Turkey, or with Russia, that the military aid we have given to Turkey and Greece would be of any military value to us? Not one whit. Not one whit. It would never be a conventional war. That would immediately proceed into a nuclear war. And it would be the nuclear power of the United States that

would protect Turkey and Greece—not the military aid that we have sent to Turkey and Greece. Much better that we had not spent these huge sums of money—over \$1 billion for Greece and over \$2 billion for Turkey in military aid from the United States to build up these powerful, conventional military machines of theirs that they are now using to threaten each other into a possible war between the two of them.

We are a funny people. We always like to exclude ourselves from the area of cause to effect. But we must assume our fair share of guilt, for words of warning have been raised in this body for some years. Words of warning have been raised here urging that we change the form of our foreign aid to Greece and Turkey, that we stop building up these two countries, these military juggernauts that now threaten the peace in the Mediterranean with the potentiality of threatening the peace of the world.

I would never have favored turning either the military or the economic aid over to the governments of either Turkey or Greece, because in Turkey we have built up a state industry, thoroughly economically corrupt.

Ten days or so ago I pointed out that we have built up state socialism in Turkey, a state socialism operated by military dictators. I am aghast that American political leaders still have the audacity to try to tell the American people that we are supporting freedom in Turkey. There is no freedom in Turkey. It is not a free society. It is a totalitarian society. We shall never further the cause of peace in the world by totalitarianism, and particularly by supplying military aid to totalitarian regimes or giving economic aid government-to-government to totalitarian regimes, because we shall get the same kind of misuse of it in other places as we have had in Turkey.

The Comptroller General has found shocking misuse of foreign aid funds in Turkey. Has anyone from the administration answered me on the floor of the Senate? No, because they cannot. Those facts are facts and they are unanswerable.

What is the alibi? We are doing it for political reasons. If it has not been demonstrated by now, it can never be demonstrated that we cannot buy political support, because people that would support such bribes will not stay bribed. I think that is about as clear a way to put it as it can be put in the king's English. We have tried to buy with American taxpayers' dollars political support around this world from totalitarians and they are using us, not we them. When it is to their purposes to defy us, they do so.

The same thing applies to Pakistan and India. We are building up there two powerful military machines as we built them up in Greece and Turkey, putting those two countries in a position so they can go to war and may go to war over Kashmir. We ought to stop that, too.

So I hope that the Cyprus situation may cause some of my colleagues in the